



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

This tendency is still more characterized in the later comedies, where the servants always imitate the loves and intrigues of their masters. These comedies usually contain a second plot, and this is always a travesty of the general plot.

The Committee appointed to nominate officers for the year 1893 then reported as follows :

For President, Professor Francis A. March.

For Secretary, Professor James W. Bright.

For Treasurer, Professor John E. Matzke.

For the Executive Council : Professors Albert S. Cook, H. C. G. Brandt, H. C. G. von Jagemann, Walter D. Toy, J. B. Henneman, Morgan Callaway, Jr., H. A. Todd, G. A. Hench, F. M. Warren.

For President of the Phonetic Section, Professor A. Melville Bell. For Secretary of the Phonetic Section, Professor C. H. Grandgent.

For President of the Pedagogical Section, Professor Charles Harris. For Secretary of the Pedagogical Section, Professor A. N. Van Daell.

For the Editorial Committee: Professors A. Marshall Elliott and T. W. Hunt.

The report was accepted, and on motion the Secretary cast the ballot electing the above candidates to the offices named.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Association was called to order at 4 o'clock.

10. MS. 24310 and other MSS. in the Paris National Library which contain French Metrical Versions of the Fables of Walter of England. By Professor T. Logie, of Williams College, Mass.

Professor A. Marshall Elliott :

Prof. Logie has touched upon a subject that is fascinating, and one certainly in which no two individuals have yet agreed throughout Fable literature. When you come back to the manuscripts, you get still further

off. Each investigator finds difficulty in being consistent with himself as his investigation proceeds.

There are two or three questions suggested by the paper that I should like to ask. One of the MSS. he has examined and presented the results of that examination to you here, 24310, is a MS. that I have had occasion to use in connection with Marie de France. Speaking of it in particular with reference to the 19123 MS., and the omissions in it as compared to the latter, I should like to ask whether these omissions have been traced in other places. Could these be traced elsewhere it might give us an idea of where the MS. was taken from, or, probably, where the scribe lived who worked on it. Do these omissions exist in other MSS. from which this one derives? Did the scribe simply follow his copy? If they do exist in other MSS., do they, or do they not, correspond exactly to these noted here? The answer to these questions might give us some clue to the scribe.

Another point is with reference to the originals of these copies, whether they have been traced. The prologue and epilogue vary here. The prologue of MS. 24310 differs considerably in the number of verses from that of others. In one you have an epilogue of eighteen verses and a prologue of eight verses. In the prologue of the work presented there are twenty-six verses, and only eight verses in another one belonging to the same general set. The question arises, What has become of the other verses? Have they been added or drawn from some other work? If they were not drawn from some other work, that would give a clue to finding out something of the origin of the manuscript.

Another point. Do these MSS. come apparently from the same source? Is there sufficient evidence in the agreement of the manuscripts to show that they came from one source, or were they drawn from various sources? In other words, were the scribes that copied the four manuscripts, from different parts of the country, and did they work in different circumstances on the same original, or did they copy from various originals? It seems to me that this is a question which ought to be very thoroughly investigated, and the differences in the prologue would certainly help in the determination of that point.

Now, the general question arises, *Was* there a Walter of England? When Prof. Logie began, I was surprised that he spoke of Walter of England as if there were no question of his existence. To my mind, it is doubtful whether there ever was such a person as Walter of England. Jacobs assumes his existence as confidently as though there were no doubt about it, and accepts the Hervieux colophon, but I don't think that that proves anything. I think the statement is simply made, as so often happens, by a later scribe, from his imagination, or from some idea he had gotten; his statement has no weight whatever, so far as proving the existence of such a person. Foerster in his edition, has certainly wisely concluded to keep the old name Anonymus Neveletus. This was the name by which the set of fables were known and which Joseph Jacobs would place to the credit

of a Walter of England. I do not consider the point at all established that we have a Walter of England, in spite of the *Gualterus Anglicus fecit hunc librum sub nomine Esopi*. The mere fact that the MS. went under so many names, would, it seems to me, prove, considering the age, that it is very doubtful whether such a man as Walter ever existed.

Remarks upon this paper were also made by Professors A. Gerber and J. E. Matzke.

11. Erasmus' Works, especially the *Encomium Moriae* and the *Colloquia*, as Sources of Rabelais' political, religious and literary Satire. By Dr. Hermann Schönfeld, of Johns Hopkins University.

Professor J. A. Fontaine :

The expression "Erasmian spirit" seems to me slightly inadequate. Erasmus was the most brilliant representative of that satirical spirit that took an especial development towards the beginning of the sixteenth century, and was directed against the Roman church, the monks, theologians, kings, judges, or, in general, against the institutions then existing; but at the same time we should bear in mind that Erasmus was not the originator of that spirit of satire and opposition. It had already permeated to a greater or lesser degree the Provençal and French literature of the Middle Ages.

Concerning the influence of Rabelais on French literature, I do not think that too much emphasis can be laid on it. Rabelais has influenced French satire in its twofold tendencies: the philosophical or Pantagruelist tendency and the comical or panurgist tendency. There are two modern French authors that might have been mentioned on account of their direct imitation of Rabelais: Nodier imitating his style in *Histoire du roi de Bohême* and Balzac imitating both style and thought in *Contes drolatiques* . . . *pour l'esbattement des Pantagruélistes*.

Now as to whether Rabelais studied Erasmus' works. We have, I think, positive evidence that Rabelais was acquainted with Erasmus' *Querela pacis* and we may presume also that he read his other works. However, I do not think it has been satisfactorily proved that the *Epistola ad Bernardum Salignacum* was directed to Erasmus, and the controversy raised over Rabelais' famous letter is not, to my mind, yet settled. Of course it is important that it should be, because on that letter is based to a great extent the evidence of Erasmus' influence on Rabelais. I hope Dr. Schönfeld will throw more light on that question.

Now as to the *à priori* arguments. The thought and form are said to be analogous in the writings of both. That may be granted, and we may find